MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D.C., August 17, 1951.

The second meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1952, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, August 17, 1951. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman
Mr. Neild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Mr. Biddle,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. deWeldon,
also, H.P.Caemmerer, Secretary

and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on July 19, and July 20, 1951, first session, were approved.

2. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION: Mr. Finley reported that since the annual appropriation of the Commission of Fine Arts for this fiscal year has not yet been made available by Congress, and there will probably be a reduction in the amount asked for, he deemed it advisable to omit a meeting of the Commission during the month of September unless there should be unforeseen matters requiring the immediate attention of the Commission. Also, Mr. Finley stated that he was planning to leave for Europe on an important business trip September 6th, returning October 22d. He recommended Thursday, October 25th, and possibly the 26th for the next meeting of the Commission, and in this the Commission concurred.

3. THEATER PERFORMANCES FOR WASHINGTON: Honorable Arthur G. Klein, House of Representatives, requested the advice of the Commission regarding several Congressional Bills (H.J. Res.260, H.J.Res.294, H.R. 1225, H.R.2122, S.266) proposing "to bring to Washington, District of Columbia, theater

Commission of Fine Arts
Minutes 17aug52

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D.C., August 17, 1951.

The second meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1952, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, August 17, 1951. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman
Mr. Neild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Mr. Biddle,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. deWeldon,

also, H.P.Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: The Minutes of the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on July 19, and July 20, 1951, first session, were approved.

2. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION: Mr. Finley reported that since the annual appropriation of the Commission of Fine Arts for this fiscal year has not yet been made available by Congress, and there will probably be a reduction in the amount asked for, he deemed it advisable to omit a meeting of the Commission during the month of September unless there should be unforseen matters requiring the immediate attention of the Commission. Also, Mr. Finley stated that he was planning to leave for Europe on an important business trip September 6th, returning October 22d. He recommended Thursday, October 25th, and possibly the 26th for the next meeting of the Commission, and in this the Commission concurred.

3. THEATER PERFORMANCES FOR WASHINGTON: Honorable Arthur G. Klein, House of Representatives, requested the advice of the Commission regarding several Congressional Bills (H.J. Res.260, H.J.Res.291, H.R. 1225, H.R.2122, S.266) proposing "to bring to Washington, District of Columbia, theater

productions of State, Land-grant, and other accredited colleges and universities."

The Commission considered the Bills and decided that there should be no objection to the enactment of any of these Bills if in each case the agency of the Government concerned would agree to the plan proposed,(Exhibit A).

4. MAHATMA GANDHI MEMORIAL: The Commission considered the reports made by the National Park Service (Exhibit B) and by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission (Exhibit C) agreeing to making the Barnard Hill Park site available for the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial, provided Mr. J.J.Singh, President of the India League of America, agrees to certain "provisos" set forth in consequence of a number of stipulations made by him in connection with the proposed use of this location for the memorial.

A letter was sent to Mr. Singh asking for a specific reply before the matter is taken up further with the Joint Committee on the Library, which must finally approve the site (Exhibit D).

5. "OLD GEORGETOWN ACT": The Commission were in conference with the Committee of Architectural Consultants, represented by Mr. Macomber and Mr. Foster regarding problems relating to the administration of the Act. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit E), as also a copy of the Memorandum submitted by Mr. Peets, (Exhibit E-1) and Mr. Macomber (Exhibit E-2) pertaining to the subject.

The Commission recognized the fact that the problems involved in the administration of the Act are numerous and intricate, but felt the Committee is doing a very satisfactory work in connection with the cases as they are being submitted by the Director of Inspection of the District of Columbia.

The Commission felt that in due time a pamphlet should be published on the subject of the "Old Georgetown Act" embodying policies agreed upon by the

productions of State, Land-grant, and other accredited colleges and universities."

The Commission considered the Bills and decided that there should be no objection to the enactment of any of these Bills if in each case the agency of the Government concerned would agree to the plan proposed. (Exhibit A).

4. MAHATMA GANDHI MEMORIAL: The Commission considered the reports made by the National Park Service (Exhibit B) and by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission (Exhibit C) agreeing to making the Barnard Hill Park site available for the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial, provided Mr. J.J.Singh, President of the India League of America, agrees to certain "provisos" set forth in consequence of a number of stipulations made by him in connection with the proposed use of this location for the memorial.

A letter was sent to Mr. Singh asking for a specific reply before the matter is taken up further with the Joint Committee on the Library, which must finally approve the site (Exhibit D).

5. "OLD GEORGETOWN ACT": The Commission were in conference with the Committee of Architectural Consultants, represented by Mr. Bacomber and Mr. Foster regarding problems relating to the administration of the Act. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit E), as also a copy of the Memorandum submitted by Mr. Peets, (Exhibit E-1) and Mr. Bacomber (Exhibit E-2) pertaining to the subject.

The Commission recognized the fact that the problems involved in the administration of the Act are numerous and intricate, but felt the Committee is doing a very satisfactory work in connection with the cases as they are being submitted by the Director of Inspection of the District of Columbia.

The Commission felt that in due time a pamphlet should be published on the subject of the "Old Georgetown Act" embodying policies agreed upon by the

Commission of Fine Arts and the Board of Architectural Consultants, as well as rules and regulations for the guidance of those concerned in the Georgetown work.

6. REZONING IN GEORGETOWN: The Secretary called attention to an anomaly that exists on M Street, Georgetown, namely, that the north side of M Street is zoned First Commercial and the south side Second Commercial, or for light industry, which includes lumber yards, laundries, junk shops, etc.

In view of a plan to improve the appearance of M Street as a commercial street, the Commission decided that this matter should be brought to the attention of the Zoning Commission, with a view to making both sides of M Street in Georgetown First Commercial (Exhibit F).

7. MEETING AT THE WHITE HOUSE: The Commission met with the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion at 11:15 a.m. Members of that Commission present were Senator Edward Martin, Representative Louis C. Rabaut, Representative Richard Erwin Dougherty, Mr. Douglas William Orr, A.I.A., Major General Glen E. Edgerton, Executive Director, and Colonel Gillette, Assistant; also Lorenzo S. Winslow, Architect of the White House, Mr. Allan S. Thorn, Supervising Architect, Public Buildings Administration, and Mr. Charles T. Haight, Director of Decorating Shop, of B.Altman Company, New York City.

Mr. Orr said the work presented is a culmination of a great work that has been done since Congress provided funds for it in 1949. The greater part of the money which Congress made available ($5,400,000) has been spent for structural work. The White House is now one-third larger than originally, without, however, extending, the main walls. There are six floors, namely, two basement floors, one of which is for air-conditioning equipment, a ground floor, the main floor for the State Rooms, the second floor for the President and his family, as well as guests, and the third floor for guests and servants. While the Commission is anxious to complete the work as soon as possible, indications are that about six months more will be required.

Commission of Fine Arts and the Board of Architectural Consultants, as well as rules and regulations for the guidance of those concerned in the Georgetown work.

6. ZONING IN GEORGETOWN: The Secretary called attention to an anomaly that exists on M Street, Georgetown, namely, that the north side of M Street is zoned First Commercial and the south side Second Commercial, or for light industry, which includes lumber yards, laundries, junk shops, etc.

In view of a plan to improve the appearance of M Street as a commercial street, the Commission decided that this matter should be brought to the attention of the Zoning Commission, with a view to making both sides of M Street in Georgetown First Commercial (Exhibit F).

7. MEETING AT THE WHITE HOUSE: The Commission met with the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion at 11:15 a.m. Members of that Commission present were Senator Edward Martin, Representative Louis C. Rabaut, Representative Richard Erwin Dougherty, Mr. Douglas William Orr, A.I.A., Major General Glen E. Edgerton, Executive Director, and Colonel Gillette, Assistant; also Lorenzo S. Winslow, Architect of the White House, Mr. Allan S. Thorn, Supervising Architect, Public Buildings Administration, and Mr. Charles T. Haight, Director of Decorating Shop, of B.Altman Company, New York City.

Mr. Orr said the work presented is a culmination of a great work that has been done since Congress provided funds for it in 1948. The greater part of the money which Congress made available ($5,400,000) has been spent for structural work. The White House is now one-third larger than originally, without, however, extending the main walls. There are six floors, namely, two basement floors, one of which is for air-conditioning equipment, a ground floor, the main floor for the State Rooms, the second floor for the President and his family, as well as guests, and the third floor for guests and servants. While the Commission is anxious to complete the work as soon as possible, indications are that about six months more will be required.

Mr. Haight then explained the colored renderings which were presented; first the designs for renovation of the State Rooms, and then the designs for renovation of the rooms of the President and his family on the second floor. In addition a few miscellaneous renderings were presented.

Regarding the East Room, the fabric for the curtains will be yellow Georgian Damask, with pattern suggested by the apartment of Marie Antoinette in the Trianon. There will be two fine sofas in the Adam style upholstered in blue damask. The chandeliers will be somewhat reduced in size.

The Green Room will be about the same as it was three and a half years ago. It was renovated then with green damask and the furnishings are in good condition, including the rug.

The Blue Room material will be similar to that used in 1902. There has been some change in the pattern. The draperies omit large motifs of the wall material. The crystal chandelier of the Red Room will be placed in the Blue Room.

The Red Room will have a rich red fabric based on a sample of material used in Windsor Castle. There will be a damask chenille carpet and a crystal chandelier.

The Dining Room will have green painted panelled walls. The draperies will be the yellow damask ones formerly in place. The mantle-piece will be Georgian in style. There will be an 18th century Chippendale mahogany table which has been given to the White House. There will be three sets of dining-room chairs: 24 in Chippendale style for a small group; 50 chairs covered with yellow Genoese velvet for a larger group; and 100 gold banquet chairs.

On the second floor the west end rooms are for the President and his family with some guest rooms on the north side. Mr. Haight described these briefly. Much of the material formerly used on the second floor will be used in furnishing the third floor rooms.

Mr. Haight then explained the colored renderings which were presented; first the designs for renovation of the State Rooms, and then the designs for renovation of the rooms of the President and his family on the second floor. In addition a few miscellaneous renderings were presented.

Regarding the East Room, the fabric for the curtains will be Yellow Georgian Damask, with pattern suggested by the apartment of Marie Antoinette in the Trianon. There will be two fine gold-and-white Adam style upholstered in blue damask. The chandeliers will be somewhat reduced in size.

The Green Room will be about the same as it was three and a half years ago. It was renovated then with green damask and the furnishings are in good condition, including the rug.

The Blue Room material will be similar to that used in 1902. There has been some change in the pattern. The draperies omit large motifs of the wall material. The crystal chandelier of the Red Room will be placed in the Blue Room.

The Red Room will have a rich red fabric based on a sample of material used in Windsor Castle. There will be a damask chenille carpet and a crystal chandelier.

The Dining Room will have green painted panelled walls. The draperies will be the yellow damask ones formerly in place. The mantle-piece will be Georgian in style. There will be an 18th century Chippendale mahogany table which has been given to the White House. There will be three sets of dining-room chairs: 24 in Chippendale style for a small group; 50 chairs covered with yellow Genoese velvet for a larger group; and 100 gold banquet chairs.

On the second floor the west end rooms are for the President and his family with some guest rooms on the north side. Mr. Haight described these briefly. Much of the material formerly used on the second floor will be used in furnishing the third floor rooms.

The Lincoln Room on the second floor will contain the Lincoln bed and will be decorated in the style of that period.

Thereupon, Major General Edgerton thanked Mr. Finley for the assistance given by him in the progress of the work as Advisor to the White House Commission, and also for the gifts of several valuable crystal chandeliers and pieces of furniture that will have a place in the renovated White House, which were secured through the aid of Mr. Finley.

The Commission unanimously considered the treatment of the rooms to be excellent, and a report was sent to the Commission on the Renovation of the White House accordingly (Exhibit G).

8. GOVERNMENT AND ART: The Commission were in Conference with Major General Orlando Ward, Chief of the Division of Military History, Department of the Army, concerning the subject of Government and Art, and to hear a report by him on his recent visit in Korea.

The Commission expressed their appreciation of the information given by General Ward. His report and the discussion which followed will be embodied in the general report of the Commission of Fine Arts on Government and Art.

Professor Hudnut read a preliminary outline that he had drafted for the forthcoming Report on Government and Art, which the Commission appreciated.

Mr. Biddle said he planned to devote some time to the subject and the report prior to his leaving for Europe early in October to be gone a year.

9. STATUARY FOR THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: Mr. Leo Friedlander, in company with his son, Gordon Friedlander, met with the Commission to discuss the problems that were presented by the former by letter at the July meeting of the Commission relating to the casting of the equestrian group "Sacrifice", in which there are a number of defects. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit H).

It was decided that the Secretary should confer with Mr. H.T. Thompson,

The Lincoln Room on the second floor will contain the Lincoln bed and will be decorated in the style of that period.

Thereupon, Major General Edgerton thanked Mr. Finley for the assistance given by him in the progress of the work as Advisor to the White House Commission, and also for the gifts of several valuable crystal chandeliers and pieces of furniture that will have a place in the renovated White House, which were secured through the aid of Mr. Finley.

The Commission unanimously considered the treatment of the rooms to be excellent, and a report was sent to the Commission on the Renovation of the White House accordingly (Exhibit G).

8. GOVERNMENT AND ART: The Commission were in Conference with Major General Orlando Ward, Chief of the Division of Military History, Department of the Army, concerning the subject of Government and Art, and to hear a report by him on his recent visit in Korea.

The Commission expressed their appreciation of the information given by General Ward. His report and the discussion which followed will be embodied in the general report of the Commission on Fine Arts on Government and Art.

Professor Hudnut read a preliminary outline that he had drafted for the forthcoming Report on Government and Art, which the Commission appreciated.

Mr. Biddle said he planned to devote some time to the subject and the report prior to his leaving for Europe early in October to be gone a year.

9. STATUARY FOR THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: Mr. Leo Friedlander, in company with his son, Gordon Friedlander, met with the Commission to discuss the problems that were presented by the former by letter at the July meeting of the Commission relating to the casting of the equestrian group "Sacrifice", in which there are a number of defects. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit H).

It was decided that the Secretary should confer with Mr. H.T. Thompson,

Associate Superintendent of the Office of National Capital Parks as soon as Mr. Thompson returns from vacation, with a view to having an inspection of the equestrian group made by Mr. Bedi, at which Mr. Friedlander and Mr. deWeldon would be present.

10. NEVIUS TRACT: The Secretary presented the following letter received from the National Capital Park and Planning Commission regarding the Nevius Tract:

August 17, 1951

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Subject: H.R.5176 - To create a National Monument Commission

Attached for your information is a copy of the Commission's Bill H.R.5176, To create a National Monument Commission. This proposed legislation has the approval of the President, and printed copies have just been received this morning. Also attached is a copy of the Commission's letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives requesting introduction of the legislation.

The bill has been referred to the same Committee handling the Smith bill authorizing the sale of the Nevius Tract (H.R.1901), and I presume that Committee will schedule hearings shortly. The Commission of Fine Arts will undoubtedly be asked to report on the bill, as you will note that plans for the Monument must be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts.

We will be very glad to furnish you with any background information about our proposal.

Sincerely yours,

John Nolen, Jr.,
Director

Mr. Peets said, "This matter concerns a piece of land known as the Nevius Tract, which is just at the north end of the Arlington National Cemetery and was purchased a few years ago for the purpose of building an army hospital, a Veterans Hospital, but it was not used for that purpose, and has remained in the Government's ownership."

"The Arlington County Government feels that they are losing a large tax income from the property and would like to have it sold to private persons so that an apartment house could be built on it."

"The land is on the axis of the Mall and, although it is not the highest point as seen from the Mall, it is vital to the preservation of the quality of the Mall. Therefore, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission is asking that the Commission of Fine Arts send a letter to the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives about the matter. I have drafted such a letter (which was read and embodied in the report to the House Committee on Public Works (Exhibit I)."

Mr. Neild asked about the specific location of the Tract, and it was pointed out from a map that it is adjacent to the north wall of the Arlington National Cemetery, comprising 25 acres. The Veterans Bureau paid about $850,000 for the land, but the owners appealled for twice that sum and the courts fixed the price at $1,600,000 which the Government paid, so the Secretary reported.

Mr. Finley asked if this Tract should not be made a part of the Arlington National Cemetery, and the Commission agreed that it should be. "It seems to me that the land is needed for the extension of the Cemetery. It is a commanding site for some small memorial that would not interfere with the view from the Mall and at the same time would prevent the intrusion of any building on the site."

Continuing, Mr. Finley said,"I remember several years ago there was brought before the Commission a design for a large apartment house, the lights of which would have been seen at night over the top of the Lincoln Memorial and would have spoiled the view from the Mall. That danger was avoided by having the Government buy the land. It would be a great calamity now

if the Government should sell the land to private individuals. It seems to me an extrordinary idea the Government should sell property it owns merely to increase the revenue of Arlington County."

Mr. Peets, calling attention to H.R.1901, said "That is a counter-attack from the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, providing for a special type of monument or memorial to be built on the Nevius Tract, the memorial to honor the life and ideals and history of the country — not to any particular individual, and is considered to be appropriate politically because it would not raise opposition on the basis of political grounds. There could be a terrace where one could walk back and forth and obtain a wonderful view of Washington."

Accordingly, the letter above mentioned was sent, strongly recommending the Nevius Tract be kept by the Government. (See Exhibits I and I-1)

The Commission adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

August 17, 1951.

Dear Congressman Klein:

In further reference to your communication of July 23, enclosing for the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, copies of Bills H.J. Res. 260, H.J. Res. 294, H.R. 1225, H.R. 2122, and S. 2666, having for their object "to bring to Washington, District of Columbia, theater productions of land-grant and State and other accredited colleges and universities," I have to report that the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting today gave these Bills careful consideration,

The Commission of Fine Arts have no objection to the enactment of the proposed Bills, provided, in each case, it meets with the approval of the Government Agency concerned.

With regard to H.J.Res. 294, "Authorizing the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to bring to Washington, District of Columbia, theater productions of State, land-grant, and other accredited colleges and universities," the Play given by that Commission, "Faith of Our Fathers," is performed in an out-of-door theater. It is to be regretted that in Washington there is no Opera House or large Auditorium where such performances can be given during the winter season.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman

Hon. Arthur G. Klein,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT A

COPY

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 20, 1951

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts

Dear Mr. Finley:

Your letter of June 26 requested the views of the National Park Service regarding the proposed location of the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial in Barnard Hill Park and the other questions raise by Mr. Singh, President of the India League of America in his letter to you of June 21.

The National Park Service will recommend the location of Barnard Hill Park for this memorial. However, Mr. Singh stipulates "(a) That not less than half of the area of Barnard Hill Park should be alloted for the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial." Our records show Barnard Hill Park plus adjacent Ft. Drive property to contain more than 30 acres. It is my understanding that in previous talks Mr. Singh spoke of an area of 5 acres as being quite adequate for the memorial. Therefore, the National Park Service would be reluctant to allot more than 5 acres and under no circumstances would we agree to allot one half of the reservation.

Mr. Singh's second stipulation was "(b) That it is understood that no other building will be erected on the balance of the site." The National Park Service could not agree to a stipulation which would result in undesirable restrictions in the use and development of the remainder of the area. In conversations with Mr. Singh he was given the assurance that the remainder of the park area would not be developed in a manner which would be incongruous or out of keeping with the memorial. It is quite conceivable that such a development or use might require the erection of one or more buildings.

Mr. Singh's third stipulation "(c) That it is also understood that whatever use is made of the other half of this site, it will be in keeping with the spirit of the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial" is taken care of in the previous papagraph.

This Service is aware of no objection to Mr. Singh's fourth and last stipulation that the area which stands highest on the hill is to be designated for the memorial.

Sincerely yours,

A.E. Demaray
Director

EXHIBIT B

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 29, 1941

Mr. David F. Finley, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts

Dear Mr. Finley:

Your letter of June 26 requested the views of the National Park Service regarding the proposed location of the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial in Barnard Hill Park and the other questions raise by Mr. Singh, President of the India League of America in his letter to you of June 21.

The National Park Service will recommend the location of Barnard Hill Park for this memorial. However, Mr. Singh stipulates "(a) That not less than half of the area of Barnard Hill Park should be allotted for the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial." Our records show Barnard Hill Park plus adjacent Pt. Drive property to contain more than 30 acres. It is my understanding that in previous talks Mr. Singh spoke of an area of 5 acres as being quite adequate for the memorial. Therefore, the National Park Service would be reluctant to allot more than 5 acres and under no circumstances would we agree to allot one half of the reservation.

Mr. Singh's second stipulation was "(b) That it is understood that no other building will be erected on the balance of the site." The National Park Service could not agree to a stipulation which would result in unnecessarily restricting the development of the remainder of the park area. In conversations with Mr. Singh he was given the assurance that the location of this memorial would be developed in a manner which would be in keeping with the park area. It is quite conceivable that such a development or use might require the erection of one or more buildings.

Mr. Singh's third stipulation "(c) That it is also understood that whatever use is made of the other half of this site, it will be in keeping with the spirit of the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial" is taken care of in the previous paragraph.

This Service is aware of no objection to Mr. Singh's [illegible] stipulation that the area which stands highest on the hill is to be selected for the memorial.

Sincerely yours,

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

COPY

August 9, 1951.

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington, 25, D.C.

Subject: Site for Mahatma Gandhi Memorial

Dear Mr. Finley:

In accordance with your letter of June 26, 1951, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, at its meeting on August 3, 1951, considered Barnard Hill Park as a site for the proposed Mahatma Gandhi Memorial. A study by the Commission's staff illustrated one possibility of development that would harmonize with the area to be retained for park use.

The Commission voted to approve the use of a part of Barnard Hill Park, in the vicinity of Eastern Avenue and Randolph Street, N.W., as a site for the Gandhi Memorial, subject to acceptance of plans for the development of the site and for the building to be erected.

Sincerely yours,

Conrad L. Wirth
Acting Executive Officer

cc - Mr. Lessmaer, Sec., Com. of Fine Arts

Mr. Kelly, Supt. National Cap. Area.

EXHIBIT C

OPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

August 17, 1951

Dear Mr. Singh:

Upon the receipt of your letter of June 21, 1951, tentatively approving the Barnard Hill Park site for the proposed Memorial to Mahatma Gandi, it was decided at a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on June 25th to request the views of the National Park Service and of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as to the question of making the site available, in the light of stipulations which you presented:

(a) That not less than half of the area of Barnard Hill Park should be alloted for the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial;

(b) That it is understood that no other building will be erected on the balance of the site;

(c) That it is also understood that whatever use is made of the other half of this site, it will be in keeping with the spirit of the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial;

(d) As I personally indicated to the representatives of the three departments who accompanied me to this site, the area which stands highest on the hill is to be designated for the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial.

I am enclosing a copy of a report from the National Park Service, replying to the stipulations as above stated.

The National Capital Park and Planning Commission, at a meeting held on August 3, 1951, "voted to approve the use of a part of Barnard Hill Park, in the vicinity of Eastern Avenue and Randolph Street, N.E., as a site for the Gandhi Memorial, subject to the acceptance of plans for the development of the site and for the building to be erected."

Before bringing this matter again to the attention of the Joint Committee on the Library, the Commission of Fine Arts desire that your Committee give further consideration to it, with a view to a concurrence in the provisos as set forth by the National Park Service and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The Commission of Fine Arts feel that they have made a reasonable compliance with your desires concerning the Barnard Hill Park site.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Mr. J.J.Singh, President,
India League of America,
40 East 49th Street,
New York 17, N.Y.

David E. Finley
Chairman

EXHIBIT D

I am enclosing a copy of a report from the National Park Service, relating to the stipulations mentioned above.

TO BE SENT LATER

EXHIBIT E

MEMORANDUM FROM MR. PEETS: Preliminary Indoctrination for Officials Enforcing the Old Georgetown Law. Presented at meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, August 17, 1951.

The law is very brief. In a few general phrases it expresses purposes and conveys powers which, in their application, must be adapted to many diverse situations. And most of those situations involve architectural conservation and restoration, a field rich in variety of professional opinion.

The law therefore needs interpretation and elaboration. As a matter of fact, when a law relates to subjects of technical nature, as to which it is impossible to specify all applications, the administrative officers who enforce the law are intended to be guided by the general body of knowledge and the best practices of that particular science or art.

In interpreting a law one always considers the conditions that led to its enactment. In this case the basic condition was the physical existence of an unusually large collection of old buildings, forming a good local museum of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century architecture and town planning.

A second circumstance was the historical interest of the town, arising particularly from its association with the early years of the city of Washington.

A third factor is this: that Georgetown is not a ghost town, a mere archeological site, nor has it been obliterated by over-prosperous growth. Through still essentially a harmonious old-time town — and one of very fetching visual charm, which is the real heroine of all this story — it is an active modern community.

However, as a fourth element in the situation, there existed an evident danger that commercial exploitation -- perhaps also the erratic tastes of

Reprinted from: Preliminary Report-Inventory to Critically
Interpret the Old Georgetown Law. Presented at meeting of the Commission
of Fine Arts, August 27, 1931.

The law is very brief. In a few general phrases it expresses purposes and conveys powers which, in their application, must be exercised to many diverse situations. And most of these situations involve intellectual concentration and visualization: a fresh task in verbally appreciational opinion.

The law therefore needs interpretation and elaboration. As a matter of fact, when a law relates to such topics of technical setting, as it is impossible to specify all applications. The administrative officers who enforce the law are informed or guided by the general body of knowledge and the past practices of that particular science or art.

In interpreting a law one always considers the conditions that led to its enactment. In this case the basic condition was the physical existence of an unusually large collection of old buildings, forming a good local museum of like significance and partly interesting exterior architecture and town planning.

A second circumstance was the historical interest of the town, arising particularly from its association with the early years of the city of Washington.

A third factor is this: that Georgetown is not a ghost town, a mere archeological site, nor has it been obliterated by over-prosperous growth. Though still essentially a harmonious old-time town — and one of very fetching visual charm, which is the real heroine of all this story — it is active modern community.

However, as a thing alive in the situation, there existed an evident danger that commercial prosperity — perhaps also the erratic tastes of

individuals -- might seriously damage the area or at least interfere with its best development.

In view of these precious and irreplaceable values, and of these dangers to them, Congress enacted the Old Georgetown law. Its purposes are, of course, first to save old buildings from demolition, second to save them from desecration, and, third, to create and maintain a suitable setting for them.

The first two parts of the assignment, though likely to be less in number of cases, are pretty sure to be the more difficult. Abstractly considered, preservation is the most important part of the whole movement. For the demolitions of the past we curse the past; let us try to save the present from the curses of the future. Each case will be a battle — it is hard to lay down rules as to which buildings justify the longest fight. This much can be said, that both the wording of the law and the best practice of architectural restoration justify dependence largely on aesthetic criteria. Since the approach in such matters must be from the community viewpoint, each building being considered in relation to its surroundings, the preservation of second-rate buildings may be very desirable, in order to sustain a group.

As for the creation of a proper setting, the sidewalk suggestion is apt to be short and simple:"Make them do all new construction and remodeling in the Colonial style." It is quite possible that many advocates of the law and many of its supporters in Congress had substantially that idea and anticipated no difficulty in its application. The members of the Commission and their associated architects must keep this in mind. Still, they know that the word "Colonial" is not a magic charm that will solve all problems.

The pitfalls of the make-every-thing-Colonial formula are many. One is the fact that the name covers many regional and period styles, some of which are out of place in Georgetown. Even more destructive of the true Old

Georgetown atmosphere are the modern commercial corruptions of Colonial details. When a simple little cottage is remodled for a higher rent level with, as a finishing touch, an elaborate nationally-advertised super-Colonial red door and white frame — certainly that is not "preserving and protecting" the modest dark-painted doorways one sees so often in the genuine old houses. Seeking to out-Colonial the Colonials, squeezing the last drop of sentimental picturesqueness out of the millwork catalogs — these are very real dangers to the Georgetown movement.

Overemphasis on the word Colonial, also, causes an undervaluing of Georgetown's many beautiful post-Colonial structures. These transitional styles often harmonized very well with the older buildings; they enrich the town architecturally and contribute to its charming variety. When they have intrinsic merit they should be preserved in their original style — not destroyed or remodeled under the influence of the Colonial slogan.

Another danger is that Colonial motifs will be rendered absurd by use in the design of buildings whose function is wholly foreign to Colonial tradition. The phrase Hot Shoppe Colonial has been applied to this sort of architecture.

The essential fact here is that the Colonial style does not survive in the abstract, it survives as Colonial houses, churches, town halls. The traditional forms and the traditional uses are handed down together, cannot be understood separately. When the construction and use are new, but the forms affect to be old, then the mind brings into play no formula for their perception. No matter how photogenic the structure may be, it is sensed to be a sham.

I do not mean by this reasoning that Colonial has no place in modern life. Certainly it has a place in Georgetown, where it is the most practical measure for preserving and building up the already existing visual harmony of

the town. But Colonial of today must live chastely and with restraint. It lives in Georgetown not independently but as the servant of a time long past that created something so lovely that for our pleasure we want to save it and complete it. We want to seize this opportunity to have a town in which every street is beautiful. That is a very worth-while thing to do. In many countries organically compact and harmomious towns are common — in this country they are very few.

For making such a town out of Georgetown, the Colonial style is indispensable. It has already, in various older versions, done most of the job. Now it has chinks to fill and connections to make, with an eye to the community, not upon one house at a time. This undated contemporary Colonial — if such a phrase may be permitted -- should give us the essence and not the externals of the style. It should give us simple, familiar and well-loved materials and designs that are in harmony with the scale and form and color of the neighborhood.

The above effort to define a philosophy that may guide and coodinate the week-by-week decisions as to particular cases, seems to me on second reading to need a more realistic paragraph and a more idealistic one.

Realistically, it is plain that much of what I have said carries no weight with the weekly customers. How can you tell a builder that he cannot use Curtis millwork? The answer is that we can't, but that if outlets for publicity were available education and propaganda would do something toward toning down the popular taste in respect to Colonial details.

More idealistically, I should have liked to talk about Georgetown presenting an opportunity for a demonstration of how living architecture can

adapt itself to an existing architectural environment. I should have like to say that it would be a good thing if most new construction in Georgetown were influenced -- to just the right degree! -- by the soundest elements of modern architecture. I'd like to emphasize and elaborate on the theme of community-wide planning, making a good town, as the essential thing we are doing.

MEMORANDUM from Mr. Macomber, Chairman of the Architectural Board of Review, regarding the Old Georgetown Law. Presented at meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, August 17, 1951.

During the time this Committee has been convening, one hundred and ninety-six cases have been viewed with the greater percentage of them quite simple in determination. It has been the serious effort of this Committee to form a logical basis for determiming these cases, one that would be broad in its application, still keeping in mind the purpose of Public Law 808 with its intent tp preserve the buildings of Old Georgetown and the areas designated in the law.

It would be an uninformed person, indeed, who believed the Committee's object to be one that would transform all buildings of later periods into a false post-colonial background for the remining early buildings in Georgetown.

The problems of the Committee would be quite simple if all the buildings were of one period or at least a period over which little architectural change occured. Today there are buildings standing in Georgetown ranging in period from late 18th century to the present day including a large number of late 19th and early 20th century structures.

The great common interest in Georgetown is created by its late 18th and early 19th century houses rather than ones built after 1850. This may be a controversial point, but inasmuch as the law was passed for the purpose of preserving the buildings and areas of the earlier periods, the problem of interpreting this law is in the opinion of this Committee, one that requires architectural detail and mass sympathetic with that period described in the law.

The problems of the Committee would be quite simple if all the buildings were of one period or at least a period over which little architectural change occured. Today there are buildings standing in Georgetown ranging in period from late 18th century to the present day including a large number of late 19th and early 20th century structures.

The great common interest in Georgetown is created by its late 18th and early 19th century houses rather than ones built after 1850. This may be a controversial point, but inasmuch as the law was passed for the purpose of preserving the buildings and areas of the earlier periods, the problem of interpreting this law is in the opinion of this Committee, one that requires architectural detail and mass sympathetic with that period described in the

Eliminating its architectural detail, little would remain to identify the colonial and post-colonial periods. Therefore, it is the unanimous opinion of this Committee that the detail of any proposed work as affected by Public Law 808 should be the gauge by which it is judged. Flexibility of judgment must still prevail as there would obviously be differences of opinion in the use of detail and each would still be within the range of precedent.

This Committee wishes to place on record the above opinions as a basis upon which the law should be interpreted.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

August 17, 1951

Zoning Commission
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sirs:

Since the enactment of the law pertaining to Old Georgetown (Public Law 808,81st Congress), there has been increased activity on the part of residents and builders in the effort to renovate buildings and improve conditions in that area.

The Commission of Fine Arts, in order to carry out the duties imposed on the Commission under the above law, have appointed a Board of Architectural Consultants to whom the Director of Inspection may submit cases requiring the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. The number of cases submitted is so large that it is necessary to hold a meeting of the Board each week. Thus far, there have been nearly two hundred formal submissions and, in addition, many informal inquiries and consultations with the Board. The Board of Consultants and the Commission of Fine Arts have been liberal in their interpretation of the law and, at the same time, have been careful to see that, in the matter of architecture, the intent of the law is observed.

Recently there have been a number of applications for changes in buildings on M Street, and it has been noted that the North side of the Street is zoned First Commercial, whereas the south side is zoned Second Commercial. It is desirable to adopt a long range architectural plan for the renovation and restoration of M Street westward from 28th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. The difference in types of zoning on this Street has presented difficulties in the adoption of such a plan. The Commission, therefore, strongly recommends that the South side of M Street be rezoned First Commercial in order to bring about uniformity in zoningon that Street. It is important that this should be done as soon as possible in view of pending legislation to develop the proposed reservation at Pennsylvania Avenue and 28th Street as a "Portal to Old Georgetown". The members of the Commission of Fine Arts will greatly appreciate it if your Commission can give early and favorably consideration to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

EXHIBIT F

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

OPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

August 20, 1951

Dear Sirs:

It was a great pleasure for the Commission of Fine Arts to meet with you on August 17th, and consider the designs submitted for the treatment of the rooms of the White House, in particular the State Rooms and the private rooms of the President and his family.

The Commission recognize the stupendous task that has been imposed on your Commission, during the past two years, to make the White House structurally sound and to pursue the work of renovation according to standards of excellence. The Commission were very glad to have the opportunity to inspect the designs and to hear in detail of the plans for the treatment of the rooms. The Commission are happy to approve the color scheme and the fabrics, samples of which were submitted, and feel that your Commission are to be congratulated on the progress of the work to date.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman

Commission on Renovation of the
Executive Mansion,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT G

DISCUSSION REGARDING STATUARY FOR THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE AT MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS - AUG.17,1951.

(Messrs. Leo Friedlander and his son, Gordon Friedlander, joined the Commission at this point.)

Chairman Finley: When I talked to you on the telephone yesterday afternoon, I thought it would rush you very much to get down here. I hope you were able to come this morning.

Mr. Friedlander: I came down in the late afternoon. I would rather sleep in a hotel than on a train if I can.

Chairman Finley: We are very glad to have you here and talk over the situation in reference to the monument you designed for the Arlington Bridge.

Mr. Friedlander: It is a very unhappy situation, the results, and I am afraid the only thing to do is we will have to face it somehow or other.

I never in all my years of professional practice -- well, in 45 years, I have never seen a poor casting of that sort. It isn't only porosity and wax but many of the details have been completely lost to a degree which is a defamation of a man's work. But we have it and as I said in my letter to you and the one to Mr. Thompson, it seems to me the only solution is to bring in a bronze man and get his opinion as to what can be done.

Of course, you are going to be confronted with a problem there. The cracks in places will have to be welded and then when you weld them, you are going to have streaks due to your torch flame. That, in turn, I suppose, will have to be gilded again. Then you are confronted with the type of gilding that they do; it depends on what we do. Some types of gilding will stand up for a thousand years but they are off to a pretty poor start. A lot of the area has not been covered. I spent four days on it some weeks back with the gilder and there again is the difficulty of matching it for the simple reason that it has been given out as 24 carat. They said they used 23 as the best they could get, but we finally decided that probably what they put on there was nearer to about 18 carat.

Either the effect of the ally, the molten metal, or the process with mercury -- that I don't profess to be an expert on -- but here are a few color pictures that I took of the condition and the extreme porosity, and while there are only a few cracks, it seems to permeate the whole thing.

Another unusual thing there you can see on the side of the pedestal -- there must be some leakage coming through. I has given the pedestal an awful spotting there in so short a period of time. In this group you will find it on both sides of both ends.

If you look at these pictures that were taken soley for the purpose of showing the extreme importance -- the extreme porosity of the surfaces, and not for purposes of making purely a picture to show the thing off properly -- this is a rather unusual expedition, coming here with a microscope, but if you will look at some of those pictures it will show you the porosity that

(pause, Ian Trehilcock and Ian Cox, Aston Productions, phone the
translation at this point.)

Chairman Tinlay: When I called to you on the telephone yesterday afternoon, I thought it would mean you very much to put down here. I hope you were able to make this meeting.

Mr. Trehilcock: I was down in the Tube station. I would rather sleep in a hotel than on a train if I can.

Chairman Tinlay: We are very glad to have you here and talk over the situation in reference to the material you designed for the Tiffin studio.

Mr. Trehilcock: It is a very unique situation, the result, was (illegible) the only thing is to live with them to find if another or other.

I never in all my years of professional practice — well, in my career, I have never seen a piece reading of that sort. It isn't only material but many of the details have been completely that be a degree which is a distinction of a man's work. But to have it put on a letter by the end the one to do. Thereupon, it seems to me the only solution is to bring in a private man and get his opinion as to what can be done.

Of course, you are going to be confronted with a problem there. The (illegible) have to be pulled out then they can pull them, you see, rather to have certain the to your local fixes. That, in turn, I suppose, will have to be given regard. That you're confronted with the type of fixing that (illegible) to carry on. This type of fitting will stand to (illegible) a thousand years but they are off to a pretty poor start. A lot of the stuff has not been covered. I spent four days on it some weeks back with the (illegible) and there again is the difficulty of matching it for the simple reason that it has been given out as it stood. They said they used 23 as the best they could get, but to finally decided that probably what they put on there was nearer to about 18 count.

Either the effect of the ally, the molten metal, or the process with mercury — that I don't profess to be an expert on — but here are a few color pictures that I took of the condition and the extreme porosity, and while there are only a few spots, it seems to permeate the whole thing.

Another material thing there you can see on the side of the (illegible) — there must be some leaking through. I has been the (illegible) so anything there to be sent a sealer of some kind, or this grout or what it is that seems to pull away.

If you look at these pictures close, there is (illegible) the extreme corrosion — the extreme deterioration, coming down with a microscope, and it (illegible) out for pressure of molten metal, and this is the thing that happens — like it is rather unique condition, coming down with a microscope, and it (illegible) of these pictures I will show you the results that

pervades the whole thing. Quite a blow after the many years I put on this work, when you consider that we have given the Italian people so much help. I have been over there twice and they have got better railroad stations than we have -- probably loaned them a full billion dollars and after all by their standards of labor I doubt if these at the maximum cost them more than $25,000. Granting that they are a poor nation, nevertheless between nations that is just a drop in the bucket, especially since we have helped so extensively.

The Statue of Liberty was given to us by France and probably you could put both of these groups in there one hundred times in the volume; yet they furnished the model, the sculptor's fee, had to make a full size model; they had to make some kind of dies to beat the metal in and present a worthy present to us.

Now after all, the slip-up on this job, it seems to me, was the foundry. The foundry sent their representatives over here, the son of the originator of this foundry and he insisted that his group be put up in the crate rather than otherwise, rather an unsual procedure. The other three went up after the crates had been removed on the ground and ropes were put around either end of the belly and they were put up. Any casting that weighs from 11 to 13 tons, if it cannot stand that kind of a lift, it won't take anything. So it is obvious now the reason for him putting it up in a crate was purely to protect it and in spite of that it is possible in lifting that there was certain movement there; that I do not know.

But this I do very strongly feel: that the surfaces are so very poor, which is obvious; the foundry has had no sense of dignity in presenting it to another nation and I am a little apprehensive as to what they put inside it from the structural standpoint.

Now my son, I sent him to Italy at my own expense. He did not go there officially because that was denied. He made very sound reports, particularly of this foundry when the work was just beginning practically. They were working rather slow and had only a few pieces under way and he reported that there were sections where the metal was practically nil. He was wondering whether they were skimping on the metal; naturally, where that occurs you are going to have holes and fissures.

On the other hand, he discovered that the foundry at Milano, they put plugs in on the torso area in excess of 45. Well, I reported that and later Mr. Thompson went over there and got it from a young fellow that after I had protested the thing they had heard about it and they just welded it over and y you could not see that they had been plugged. But whether they welded them or welded the area, it could no longer be a reproduction of a man's work.

The wax process is inclined to have porosity here and there. I can understand it is not as good as our sand process. With care, they can considerably reduce them. Care simply hasn't been taken.

According to my contract, there was a provision that in view of the distance I could appoint somebody to represent me there during the casting period. This was denied me while the other gentleman was accorded that. And when I raised that point, I was simply told that for reasons of expense -- and I did not know this man from Adam -- one doesn't usually delegate somebody to so responsible a job -- somebody that you don't know, and I wanted to send somebody who had worked with me on it; and I am afraid that this is

the outcome.

What they did do was that in spite of my protests they just had him on occasions go to these foundries. The proof is in the pudding, and I am quite certain that had they accorded me the same privileges as the other sculptor we would not be sitting here trying to figure out what can be done.

But things being as they are, I think the only step right now to take, and I don't know how you gentlemem feel about it -- I feel very strongly -- that the foundry man that I had suggested that had done a number of pieces for me successfully, take a look at it and see what could be done.

On the other hand, the more extreme thing yet seems to me quite logical -- I do not see any reason for embarrassment to the Italian people -- Mr Thompson says to me in the letter of -- the Italian people don't know what the foundry has delivered. I am sure that if they knew, they would want to replace it and buy a good one. After all, he got paid for it.

I saw the Fraser castings on the ground. They were very fine castings. The Milano one, I should say, was a pretty good casting as far as the gilding on it is concerned. It is a very fine job. There is no reason why there should not have been uniformity throughout of good workmanship. My personal experience is with workmen -- in fact, with all of us, that we all need a certain amount of watching, supervision, and it must have impressed them strangely that I had told them before I left there -- the work had only started -- that somebody would come over to represent me and they welcomed the idea. Then such a person does not come. They get a feeling, it seems to me, that if this fellow is not interested in his own job, why should we be so keenly interested. But I know that if a client exacts something of me, I probably get something done in a resonable time much better than if they say, you have all the time you want.

Chairman Finley: So I can be clear on the point, did Mr. Fraser go and inspect the work in progress?

Mr. Friedlander: He had a man from Paris named Minnesalte who during the entire period supervised his work. Later, I was told that he went to the foundry and approved the work. He certainly did not approve poor workmanship.

I see no reason why it could not be diplomatically handled, if the thing cannot be repaired, through the Italian Government, to have this foundry replace a good casting. I think they would have a great deal more respect for us than to take it lying down. If much of the work we have done in Italy or any other country in Europe with Marshall Plan funds are treated this way, it is becoming a travesty. I am a strong believer in the Marshall Plan, but as to money that we are giving them -- this might be an example of what we are getting. Perhaps there should be a better check on it. This particular case was an opportunity because the contract provided for it and why in the world I was denied, I do not know because, after all, they are not dealing with me; they are dealing with what has gone up on the bridge. It is a very important site. I doubt whether any casting in Italy that stood up for one thousand years has got the perforations that this has in it and this is only starting on its journey. You have leakage there already, and when you have frost and other things --

Chairman Finley: Was the casting of Mr. Fraser done by a different firm?

the welcome.

certain that had they accorded me the visa we might, why I am quite
occasions go to Lisbon [illegible]. The proof is in the wedding, and I am quite
we would not be sitting here trying to figure out what can be done.

Two things being as they are, I think the only step right now is this.
And I don't know how you gentlemen feel about it -- I feel very strongly --
that the Library must [illegible] that fine door a number of pieces for
re an [illegible], take a look at it and see what could be done.

On the other hand, the more evidence thing yet seems to me [illegible]
-- I do not see any reason for embarrassment to the Italian people -- if Chan-
ton says to me in the letter it -- the Italian people don't [illegible] the
foundry has delivered. I am sure that if they knew, they would want to replace
it and buy a good one. After all, he got paid for it.

I saw the Fraser casting on the ground. They were very fine castings. The
fellow one, I should say, was a pretty good casting as far as the [illegible] on it
is concerned. It is a very fine job. There is no reason why there should not
have been uniformity throughout of good workmanship. My personal experience
is with workers -- in fact, with all of us, that we all need a certain amount
of watching, supervision, and it must have impressed them strongly that I had
told them before I left there -- the most two only allotted -- that somebody
would come over to represent me and they welcomed the idea. Then such a person
does not come. They get a feeling, it seems to me, that if this fellow is not
interested in his own job, why should we be so vastly interested. But I know
that if a client expects something of me, I probably get something back in a
reasonable time much better than if they say, you have all the time you want.

Chairman Finley: So I can be clear on the point, did Mr. Fowler go and inspect
the work in progress?

Mr. Cafiero: He had a man from Cerro Gordo named Dimeralle who during the entire
period supervised his work. Later, I was told that he went to the foundry and
approved the work. He certainly did not approve poor workmanship.

I see no reason why it could not be diplomatically handled, if the thing
cannot be repaired, through the Italian Government, to have this foundry re-
place a good casting. I think they would [illegible] some reasonable [illegible]
do that to take it lying down. So much of our work we have here in Italy or
any other country in Europe with Marshall Plan funds are treated this way, it
is becoming a travesty. I am a strong believer in the Marshall Plan, but we do
money that we are giving them -- this might be an example of what we are getting.
Perhaps there should be a better check on it. This particular case was an
opportunity because the contract provided for it and why in the world I was
denied, I do not know because, after all, they are not dealing with me; they
are dealing with what has gone up on the bridge. It is a very important site. I
doubt whether any casting in Italy that stood up for one thousand years has got
the [illegible] that this one is to be. It is only a question of the foundry.
You have leakage there already, and when you have frost and other things --

Chairman Finley: Was the casting of Mr. Fraser done by a different firm?

Mr. Friedlander: Each one was done in a different foundry.

Chairman Finley: You say he was allowed to have a personal representative at the Government's expense?

Mr. Friedlander: It worked through the contract. They paid him and he paid the representative.

Chairman Finley: You asked for the same privilege but were not allowed expenses?

Mr. Friedlander: They told me they wanted to husband funds. They argued that I knew the man, and I did not know this man from Adam but I did meet him in Paris and he apparently had been living over there for 25 years. I didn't know the man. Let us assume that when he was in this country 25 years ago I may have met him. The point is that I should just delegate him to so important a job.

Chairman Finley: In any event, the fact was when the casting arrived you were not allowed to see it on the ground and it was hoisted in place in the crate.

Mr. Friedlander: That is correct. I got a letter from Mr. Thompson asking me if I could come down the following morning, or Tuesday. I immediately wrote him and told him I would be down there Monday. Then the Friday of that week I heard from him; he happened to be in New York and he phoned the studio and asked whether I could come down the following day which was Saturday. And if I could, to phone him at his home. And then he mentioned that one group had already gone up. So I had other commitments, but irrespective of that, why did the group go up before I arrived inasmuch as in writing it had been agreed that I was to come and have a chance to study it, after it had been said to me that I was to see it on the ground. I saw three on the ground.

Chairman Finley: The one that was in place was the defective one?

Mr. Friedlander: That is right. That was put up in the crate and the crate removed. There was something about it in The Star on the 22nd. Incidentally, I do have a photograph of Mr. Thompson's which he sent me where a section of the crate is still up there and there is another photo taking over -- taking off the covering, the paper covering.

Chairman Finley: What were the terms of the contract? Did they provide that the casting must meet with the approval of the sculptor before it should be put in place?

Mr. Friedlander: The terms of my contract is that I was supposed to supervise the work from the beginning to end as author of it. But that provision was never adhered to. As I said before, had I been granted the clause in the contract for representation over there, that would not have happened. For instance, on the second trip when I went over there, they had assembled both models of plaster and there was some little break in it which I had to fix, which I fixed together with a helper over there.

Now, prior to that, when we all together were in Rome during November, 1949, that was four or five months previously, I requested that these models be assembled and it was but later they issued a translation of the minutes which that. I met with Mr. Thompson at the Embassy Hotel where he was stopping in Rome and

pointed it out to him. I know enough Italian to know it was missing, and he says, well that was all right; they would fix it when they got back to America. They did have their translation.

It seems later in spite of what was done there the Italian one failed. But to prove my point, irrespective of what the arrangements they had there, I did get them to make these repairs and to assemble them.

I was in Rome for three years as a fellow of the American Academy and while we Americans try to put a great many clauses into our contracts, we try to cover everything, you can enter into a deal with them and very often they do not like too many clauses and if you are there, you can get them to do certain things that are not in the agreement which was evidenced by this repair work which was not in the agreement. It had to be done and it was caused either by transit on the ship or by abuse in Italy. That I do not know. But there were serious breaks that had to be fixed. Had it not been that I was over there, it would have been too bad, but at that time, before I left, I noticed that they had just started it at Florence. They made a section mold of the base. Why they started there, I don't know. But on this particular mold, they failed to put on what they called the modray form. They just made pieces and put them together and when they squeezed it, they supported it with a lot of props. I told them I did not think that was the way to do it and they promised me in the future they would do it with the modray form.

He showed me some pieces, some sample molds -- just the head of one of the riders, to determine the gilding and it looked all right to me and then he let it slip. I saw then that it was made with a glue mold and it dawned on me that in making section glue molds, there is greater shrinkage than in plaster. When you put them together, they don't fit together. I protested that and he said this is only a sample, but nevertheless, that head went on the group; I am sure about that. I went to Milano and they made a squeeze of just the head. I think that was done all right.

I can understand that on certain sections they do not need the modray form but in most places they do because it supports it so that these molds that they have within this, we call them tacelli, will not warp or wobble. It gives it a body, rigidity and everything is then as near as possible in its proper place.

There are other factors that I brought to Mr. Thompson's attention. When they finally cast these sections into metal there were many pieces -- there were 36 in one group and 29 in the other. They have to be fitted together and with all the theorizing about this thing, every job is different and there is bound to be more shrinkage or warpage in one part than another and the artist should be there, or somebody who understands it for the fitting in order to get the proper stance.

The figure of Valor is a little off stance and that is due to that condition. The sculptor was there, or an assistant of his who had been working on the job with him -- he can look at his model and if something is slightly out of plumb it can be rectified in the metal.

There is another factor; the shrinkages vary if they take the molds off too quick. It is done here if you do not watch them. The thing is poured and they start to take the molds off before it is properly cooled and there is going to be more warpage but if they leave it in the mold, it cools very much like these telescopes that they make, leave it in the form for a considerable

time. The same principle prevails except it is only a matter of probably 48 or 72 at the maximum, hours. But if they mold it tonight and take it off tomorrow, the shrinkage is going to be greater than if they leave them within that mold. These are all factors.

Then there is the factor when you squeeze your wax into molds, you have seams. Who in the world did it, I do not know, probably a mechanic.

Chairman Finley: Mr. Friedlander, who inspected it after the moldering was completed? It must have been passed by someone. Was it provided you should see it and approve it?

Mr. Friedlander: The last trip Mr. Thompson was over there and he made a very favorable report on it and he said that he had consulted authorities on it but all the authorities in the world are not quite the same as having the author's view on this. You delegate another sculptor on a job after a man is dead. That is the only thing you can do. While the bird is still alive —

We gather that you do not approve of it. It was not done the way you like. You were not given authority to inspect.

I wonder what we can do about it since the thing is on its pedestal.

You went into the matter yourself, Mr. deWeldon. Would you tell us?

Mr. deWeldon: I reported at the last meeting about the cracks and the holes and that they could be repaired by an expert American foundryman, and welded. Then, of course, the whole would be regilded.

But there is a matter of about one head which is very poorly cast. I think the fault lies that they used the glue mold to pour the wax in and that should never be done because the melting point of glue mold to pour the wax in and that never should be done because the melting point of glue and the melting point of wax are very close together and hot wax will melt the glue before the wax cools and everything will be out of shape or look like melted butter.

Chairman Finley: What was your recommendation that we do now, now that we are faced with the situation?

Mr. deWeldon: I would suggest that an expert foundryman inspect the statue and study the structural strength of it, which is extremely important.

Chairman Finley: And that the head be recast?

Mr. deWeldon: Yes

Chairman Finley: Would that meet with your approval, Mr. Friedlander?

Mr. Friedlander: What I should think ought to be done is first get an expert foundryman to look at it and get his opinion. There is also a factor there: where they weld there will have to be chasing done because there are cracks and lumps.

The department made their own pictures which are mentioned in the letter and I think there are nine of them that show very serious defects.

Mr. Friedlander, Jr. Even more so than these photos. They are large-size snapshots and they show the details of the defects far more than these do.

Mr. deWeldon: The other three figures are all right. There is no reason why one should be not as well cast as the others.

Mr. Friedlander: I hate to burden you gentlemen with all these details. Had the thing done by a normal process, there would not be any need of it. There are a great many foundry people, foreigners, molders, that would have great difficulty in explaining how they do something but when they know it, they know every step.

Chairman Finley: Can you suggest some particular foundryman who would come in and examine it?

Mr. deWeldon: the one —

Mr. Friedlander: I would agree to have Mr. Bedi of the Duracic look at it.

Chairman Finley: That is probably good and is agreeable to Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Cammerer: Yes. Mr. Friedlander, the Commission have reported to the National Capital Parks recommending that they secure the services of a good man immediately to make the inspection and report on it. That letter went out on August 1. We did not send you a copy. We were waiting for a reply from Mr. Thompson about it. He is a way on vacation.

Chairman Finley; As soon as Mr. Thompson comes back, I suggest we try to learn from him what they propose to do and we will let you know because we are as anxious as you are.

Mr. Friedlander: I think that when inspection is made, that we will all proceed about it in the proper way. I think Mr. deWeldon as sculptor and Mr. Thompson and myself should be present when he makes that inspection.

Chairman Finley: We will suggest that to Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Caemmerer: We do not know how they stand on that; that is a matter of administration by the Park Service and off the record ... (off the record).

Mr. Biddle: I was just going to say, I have absolute sympathy with everything you have been saying. I have had enough experience with casters and especially casters in foreign countries, to know that as you said, unless the sculptor is there all the time it is a wonder that there were not more difficulties with the results. There are so many things that may go wrong in a casting.

The practical question comes: what can we now do to repair them. I do not see how you can go back to the Italian government and ask them to recast or blame it on them.

Mr. deWeldon: All the good gesture is done.

Mr. Friedlander, Jr. You could in a sense say that it was the foundry's fault. They are not the Italian government.

Mr. Biddle: I have had so infinitely worse things happen by a reputable foundry in foreign countries that unless the sculptor is there almost every day, any of these and other things may happen.

Mr. Friedlander, Jr: There was a unilateral setup on the inspections in which a man's services were utilized to supervise my father's work.

Mr. Biddle: The only reason I say this is that we weaken your position if we speak to Mr. Thompson on the basis of it might have been somebody's fault. I think the only thing to say is that these damages exist and they have to be repaired as best we can.

Mr. Friedlander: He has his own pictures of it. He wanted to assure himself. There was a scaffold there for four days when I was working there. I asked his engineer to go up. He said he wasn't well.

Mr. Neild: Have they made an endeavor to have the work corrected?

Mr. Friedlander: We have Mr. Thompson's answer to my letter. This is a letter hardly an answer to mine. I make the same proposal to see what could be done. Regardless what the foundry has done, I think the first step would be as suggested to ask Mr. Bedi to look at it and see what he would charge to do something about it.

Mr. Biddle: Right. That would be the common sense way to do.

Mr. Friedlander: I think the proper thing is to have those present --

Mr. Biddle: Should you get an estimate of cost for all necessary repairs to do a one hundred percent job.

Mr. Friedlander: He says, I have your letter of July 16 -- copy of which the Commission has; they don't say that here -- and I appreciate having your comments and suggestions regarding the group, Sacrifice, which you designed for the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

Without attempting to weigh the merits of your observations and suggestions, I am very much of the opinion that we should not openly criticize a gift from the people of Italy, nor should we embark on any course of action at this time which might be detrimental to the successful completion of an undertaking that has taken so many years to accomplishment.

In the circumstances, I feel that we are obliged to withold any positive action on the suggestion of your July 16 letter. Sincerely yours.

Now, this letter here, where he speaks of successful completion of an undertaking that has taken so many years to accomplish, his interpretation is open to question as to what he considers successful. They could hardly honestly say that that casting is a success. So if he is thinking purely in terms of dedication or something --

Mr. Peets: Would there be serious difficulty with the idea that Bedi's survey

should be made at the earliest possible moment?

Mr. Friedlander: I think so, yes.

Mr. Peets: There is a possibility that the matter of correcting and repairs, of putting up the scaffolding could be left until after the dedication.

Mr. Friedlander: For him to get up there, they could put up a temporary scaffold. They can put that up in a matter of an hour or so, as long as he can get up there and look at it.

Mr. Hudnut: This suggestion may come under the head of silly remarks, but why don't you call the situation to the attention of the ambassador? Would he know about it?

Mr. Friedlander: I am afraid not.

Mr. Hudnut: Why not bring that matter to his attention, as a friend of Italy.

Mr. Friedlander: I meant before when I said through diplomatic channels it could be brought to his attention and I am sure he would want to know about it, what all four foundries did and this was the worst casting and who was sent over here to supervise the installation.

Mr. Peets: Offhand, do you know how much money it is going to cost? After all, that is the critical thing. Then the Department of State and the Italian Embassy --

Mr. Neild: I have seen the group. I think anyone, even a layman could appreciate it needs repairs.

Mr. Friedlander: You can see from the street. People have communicated with me and said they have liked it, - very much; a horrible catastrophe that it was so poor -- sort of condolences. Said to me that after all there are some fine antiques to come up through the centuries seriously marked and we can still appreciate them.

Chairman Finley: You do not need to prove your case to us. We are completely in sympathy with you and I feel that we must get the defects corrected. I think it is too bad you were not given an opportunity to inspect them, which I think is possible for defects and we will even sit with Mr. Thompson and get Mr. Bedi here and find out what can be done to correct them and when there is some decision, they can write you and perhaps you can come in and meet and try to direct it on the ground. I think that is the practical way to do. I think it would be difficult to ask Italy -- I think that would undo much of the gesture that has been made.

Mr. Friedlander: I do think and I agree with this gentleman that it should be brought to the Italian Embassy's attention in a dignified way because it is a pretty serious thing.

Mr. Hudnut: He would be the first to wish it was corrected.

Mr. Hudnut: He would be the first to wish it was corrected.

Mr. Friedlander: I do think and I agree with this gentleman that it should be brought to the Italian Embassy's attention in a dignified way because it is a pretty serious thing.

Mr. Hudnut: This suggestion may come under the head of silly remarks, but why don't you call the situation to the attention of the ambassador? Would he know about it?

Mr. Friedlander: I am afraid not.

Mr. Hudnut: Why not bring that matter to his attention, as a friend of Italy.

Mr. Friedlander: I would be more than glad to if I could [illegible] could be brought to his attention and I am sure he would want to know about it, [illegible] over there by reporting the [illegible].

Mr. Peets: Offhand, do you know how much money it is going to cost? After all, that is the untried thing. Then the [illegible] and the Italian [illegible] —

Mr. Neild: I have seen the group. I think anyone, even a layman could appreciate it needs repairs.

Mr. Friedlander: You can see from the street. People have communicated with me and said they have filled it - very much; a horrible catastrophe that it was so poor — sort of condolences. Said to me that after all there are some fine antiques to come up through the centuries seriously marked and we can still appreciate them.

Chairman Finley: You do not need to prove your case to us. We are completely in sympathy with you and I feel that we must get the defects corrected. I think here and find out what can be done to correct them and when there is some declaration, they can write you and perhaps you can come in and meet and try to direct it on the ground. I think that is the practical way to do. I think it would be difficult to ask Italy — I think that would undo much of the gesture that has been made.

Mr. Friedlander, Jr.: I think he would because the Italians take those matters very seriously. It need not be a complaint -- just, have you seen so and so.

Mr. Friedlander: They have some displays of some very fine work that they are capable of doing, and what possessed them to turn out a thing like that with sections that look as though it was full of warts.

Chairman Finley: I am not clear about how this was done. Was some of the Marshall Plan money used to put the foundry in condition or was it a free-will gesture?

Mr. Friedlander: As far as I know, the thing originated first when they had no outlet for doing this thing and it was suggested perhaps through Marshall aid. I think I have some letters from somewhere, a copy of the letter, where he recommends to another legislator that perhaps it can be done on that basis, and later it seemed that something developed which I know very little about on the idea of presenting it to us.

I think it would have been very much better if it had been worked through Marshall aid and eliminated the sentimental side of it and placed the artist in a position in which he could deal directly with the foundry in the same manner as if he did the job at home. If I had something to be done in Italy or Holland or God knows where -- France -- naturally, you would want to deal directly with the French people and not the government there or any of their officials.

Frankly speaking, they knowing as much about the process here as the boys in the Interior Department --

Chairman Finley: I think we have learned from experience and I agree that Mr. Thompson or some of us could talk to Mr. Tarchiani, the Italian Ambassador, who I am sure would be most sympathetic about this but it ought to be kept out of public notice.

Mr. Peets: Through the Italian man at the State Department, I knew the man who was in charge. George Black was in charge of the Italian Affairs, cultural relations, and for Italy at the time this work was done and he told me about meeting Thompson and so on and so on. But unfortunately, he has been moved to Tunisia; but his successor there, the cultural relations man for Italy, would be the man who was probably responsible. He was the talking agent for our State Department and would be the one to go to the Italian Embassy.

Mr. Hudnut: Wouldn't that give it semi-official character? I think the best man in the world to do it is Mr. Finley, individually, as Director of the National Gallery, and simply say in the most informal way, I wonder if anyone has called your attention to this situation. Because I think if a man goes from the State Department, that is an official act of our Government and makes the- --

Mr. Peets: Not on that level.

Mr. Hudnut: It is a complaint, isn't it, or criticism?

Mr. Friedlander: They have some displays of some very fine work that they are capable of doing, and what possessed them to turn out a thing like that as though it was full of weeds.

Chairman Findley: I am not clear about how this was done. Was some of the Marshall Plan money used to put the foundry in condition or was it a free-will gesture?

Mr. Friedlander: So far as I know, the thing originated first when they had no outlet for doing this thing and it was suggested perhaps through [illegible] I think I have seen Cultural Exchanges, a copy of the Library, where is recommended or another Ambassador like perhaps it may or does go that path, and later it seemed that something [illegible] idea of presenting it to us.

I think it would have been very much better if it had been worked through normal and efficient [illegible] manner as it be did the job at home. If I had something to be done in Italy or Holland or God knows where -- France -- naturally, you would want to deal directly with the local people and not the [illegible] officials.

Frankly speaking, they knowing as much about the process here as the boys in the Embassy [illegible] --

Chairman Findley: I think we have learned from experience and I agree that Mr. Thompson or some of us would talk to Mr. [illegible], the Italian Ambassador, who I am sure would be most sympathetic about this but it ought to be kept out of public notice.

Mr. Peeke: Through the Italian man at the State Department. I knew the man who was in charge. George Black was in charge of the Italian Affairs, cultural relations, and for Italy at the time this work was done and be told me about meeting Thompson and so on and so on. But unfortunately, he has been moved to Tunisia; but his successor there, the cultural relations man for Italy, would be the man who was possibly responsible. He was the [illegible] state Department and would be the one to go to the Italian Embassy.

Mr. [illegible] give it semi-[illegible] I mean the best man in the world to do it is Mr. Finley, individually, as Director of the [illegible] Office, has called your attention to this situation. Because I think if a man goes from the State Department, that is an official act of our Government and makes the --

Mr. Peeke: Not on that level.

Mr. Hughes: It is a complaint, isn't it, or criticism?

Mr. Peets: No. For one thing this story may be kept out of the newspapers but everybody would kmow about it one way or another, at least those people closely interested in such a thing, and it would undoubtedly come to that fellow who is the man for Italy in cultural relations.

Mr. Hudnut: In the course of time —

Mr. Peets: There should be a group of peesons who are in on the thing or who are affected. He is quite interested in this thing because he worked with Thompson on their arrangements and so on, and the program, and he is a factor; and I am sure that the Italian Embassy would want him and he is our contact man with the Embassy. I feel that protocal requires his coming in.

Mr. Hudnut: I gave you all that just to indicate taking the initiative. The important thing is that the way should not be offensive or have official character --so that he knows about it.

Mr. Peets: I was at a cocktail party at Tom Black's house and I met several Italian people there. I think one of them was that same man in the Embassy. At that level they justoring each other on the phone. Isn't that true?

Chairman Finley: Probably, yes. In any event, we are not going to ask the Italian Government to recast it because that would be awkward. I think the best procedure is to get Mr. Bedi here to see what can be done to correct the defects, and perhaps the ambassador ought to be told about it privately. A man interested in art and things of that sort would want to know. Perhaps we ought to consult with Mr. Thompson about it because we don't want to do anything that would embarrass him.

Mr. Friedlander: There is another point that is quite obvious that you cannot prevent them from seeing and the sooner something is done the better. A man came up to me and said, this thing is porous. Do you think I could tell him it wasn't?

Chairman Finley: It is staining the pedestal so it is obvious there is some defect. Mr. Caemmerer, when will Mr. Thompson come back from vacation?

Mr. Caemmerer: He will be back in about a week.

Chairman Finley: Would you tell him we have had another meeting with Mr. Friedlander and we would like to know when he can get together with Mr. Bedi to meet with Mr. Friedlander and Mr, deWeldon. I don't think there is any more we can do about it.

Thank you very much for coming and telling us these dreadful details that we did not know. We had already written a letter, as we told you. We completely understand your position and are very sympathetic with it.

Mr. Friedlander: Mr. Finley, the discouraging thing is that these things were predicted over a year ago and no steps were taken to correct them. I am afraid that is water over the dam now.

(Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.)

Mr. Bradley: I feel that protocol requires his coming in.

Mr. Bradley: I gave you all that just to indicate taking the initiative. The important thing is that the way should not be offensive or have official clearance -- that he knows about it.

Mr. Bradley: I was on a medical party on the Fourth [illegible] Italian people there. I think one of them was that same man in the Embassy. At that level they [illegible] on the phone. Don't take that [illegible]

Chairman Finley: [illegible] ought to consult with us. Thompson about it because we don't want to do anything that would embarrass him.

Mr. Friedlander: There is another point that is quite obvious that you cannot prevent them from seeing and the sooner something is done the better. A man came up to me and said, this thing is porous. Do you think I could tell him it wasn't?

Chairman Finley: It is steaming the pedestal so it is obvious there is some [illegible].

Mr. Gesmundo: He will be back in about a week.

Chairman Finley: Would you tell him we have had another meeting with Mr. Friedlander and we would like to know when he can get together with Mr. Bradley to meet with Mr. Friedlander and Mr. [illegible]. I don't think there is any more we can do about it.

Thank you very much for coming and telling us these forceful details that underscore your position and are very symbiotic with it.

predicated over a year ago and no steps were taken to correct them. I [illegible] that is water over the dam now.

(Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.)

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

August 22, 1951

My dear Mr. Buckley:

The Commission of Fine Arts have given careful consideration to H.R. 1901, providing for the sale of the Nevius tract in Arlington County which is now owned by the United States Government.

The Commission hope that the Nevius tract will not be sold but will be held for the future extension of Arlington National Cemetery. They feel that this additional land will be needed in the future for the burial of those who have died in the country's service and for monuments erected in their honor. The Commission also feel that the sale of the Nevius tract to individuals, who might erect commercial buildings or housing developments in this area, would have a most unfortunate effect on the development of the City of Washington, especially of the Mall as a great monumental composition extending from the Capitol to Arlington Ridge in Virginia. The beautiful wooded hill, which comprises the Nevius tract, should be considered, in our opinion, an integral part of the Mall. The construction of large buildings on the Nevius tract would destroy the beauty and dignity of the wooded background of the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument; and, if any structures are to be built on this site in the future, they should be simple and low in scale in order not to detract from the large memorials on the Mall.

The members of the Commission, therefore, hope the proposed sale of the Nevius tract will not be authorized and that this area will be retained for the future extension of the Arlington National Cemetery.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Charles A. Buckley
Chairman
Committee on Public Works
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT I

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

August 22, 1951

My dear Mr. Buckley:

The Commission of Fine Arts have given careful consideration to H.R. 1901, providing for the sale of the Nevius tract in Arlington County which is now owned by the United States Government.

The Commission hope that the Nevius tract will not be sold but will be held for the future extension of Arlington National Cemetery. They feel that this additional land will be needed in the future for the burial of those who have died in the country's service and for monuments erected in their honor. The Commission also feel that the sale of the Nevius tract to individuals, who might erect commercial buildings or housing developments in this area, would have a most unfortunate effect on the development of the City of Washington, especially of the Mall as a great monumental composition extending from the Capitol to Arlington Ridge in Virginia. The beautiful wooded hill, which comprises the Nevius tract, should be considered, in our opinion, an integral part of the Mall. The construction of large buildings on the Nevius tract would destroy the beauty and dignity of the wooded background of the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument; and, if any structures are to be built on this site in the future, they should be simple and low in scale in order not to detract from the large memorials on the Mall.

The members of the Commission, therefore, hope the proposed sale of the Nevius tract will not be authorized and that this area will be retained for the future extension of the Arlington National Cemetery.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Charles A. Buckley
Chairman
Committee on Public Works
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT I

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WASHINGTON, D.C.

August 27, 1951

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington 25, D.C.

H.R. 1901

My dear Mr. Finley:

Your letter of August 22d with reference to the bill above which provides for the sale of the Nevius tract in Arlington County is at hand.

I note your Commission favors holding this tract for the future extension of Arlington Cemetary, and that it should be considered a integral part of the Mall.

Your letter will be laid before the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and the full Committee on Public Works.

Assuring you that your statement will be given most careful consideration bt me, and by the full Committee, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Charles A. Buckley
Chairman
(Committee on Public Works)

EXHIBIT I - 1

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WASHINGTON, D.C.

August 27, 1951

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington 25, D.C.

H.R. 1901

My dear Mr. Finley:

Your letter of August 22d with reference to the bill above which provides for the sale of the Nevius tract in Arlington County is at hand.

I note your Commission favors holding this tract for the future extension of Arlington Cemetary, and that it should be considered a integral part of the Mall.

Your letter will be laid before the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and the full Committee on Public Works.

Assuring you that your statement will be given most careful consideration bt me, and by the full Committee, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Charles A. Buckley
Chairman
(Committee on Public Works)

EXHIBIT I - 1